

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT OF OHIO
HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO**

STATE OF OHIO,	:	APPEAL NOS. C-080237
		C-080238
Plaintiff-Appellee,	:	TRIAL NOS. B-0601526
		B-0408062A
vs.	:	
		<i>JUDGMENT ENTRY.</i>
JAMAAN HOWARD,	:	
Defendant-Appellant.	:	

We consider this appeal on the accelerated calendar, and this judgment entry is not an opinion of the court.¹

Defendant-appellant Jamaan Howard was convicted of forgery in November 2004 in the case numbered B-0408062A. The trial court imposed community-control sanctions that Howard violated in March 2006. Despite those violations, the trial court continued his community control for two more years. In June 2006, Howard was convicted of possession of marijuana in the case numbered B-0701526. He was sentenced to two years of community control. In March 2008, Howard entered a no-contest plea to charges that he had violated his community-control sanctions under both case numbers. In both cases, the trial court revoked Howard's community control and imposed a six-month prison term for the forgery conviction and a concurrent one-year prison term for the possession conviction. Howard now appeals his convictions and sentences.

¹ See S.Ct.R.Rep.Op. 3(A), App.R. 11.1(E), and Loc.R. 12.

After reviewing the record and the applicable law, Howard's appointed appellate counsel, pursuant to *Anders v. California*,² states in his brief that he has found no errors in the proceedings below, has moved to withdraw as counsel, and has requested this court to review the record for any reversible error.

Under *Anders*, this court is now charged with the task of independently reviewing the record for any prejudicial errors that would warrant the reversal of the trial court's judgments. After reviewing the entire record, we conclude that there was no prejudicial error in the proceedings below, and we hold that there are no grounds to support a meritorious appeal. Howard's no-contest plea was entered and accepted in accordance with Crim.R. 11(C), and we cannot say that the trial court's revocation of Howard's community control was unreasonable given the previous violation of his community-control sanctions. The judgment of the trial court is, therefore, affirmed, and counsel's motion to withdraw is hereby overruled.

Although we have concluded that this appeal is frivolous pursuant to App.R. 23 and is without "reasonable cause" under R.C. 2505.35, we refrain from taxing costs and expenses against Howard because it is clear from the record that he is indigent.

Further, a certified copy of this Judgment Entry shall be sent to the trial court under App.R. 27. Costs shall be taxed under App.R. 24.

SUNDERMANN, P.J., HILDEBRANDT and DINKELACKER, JJ.

To the Clerk:

Enter upon the Journal of the Court on December 3, 2008
per order of the Court _____.
Presiding Judge

² (1967), 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396.